

REMARKS

Claim 40 has been allowed and claims 4-9, 27-30 and 38 were "objected to". Therefore, new claims 44-54 are added and correspond, respectively, to "objected to" claims 4-9, 27-30 and 38, written in independent form to be allowable.

Claims 1, 10, 18, 22, 26, 28, 33 and 38 have been amended.

Claims 1-54 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 10-17, 19-26, 31, 32 AND 41-43 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER FUJII ET AL (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,144,095; HEREINAFTER "FUJII") IN VIEW OF MUKAI (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,446,095):

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to a popularity degree calculating method for calculating a popularity degree indicating the height of a popularity of a document in a network. The method comprises extracting documents updated and collected during a first time period and calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents based on information about relations of said particular one referencing to the other extracted documents and of said particular one referenced by the other extracted documents.

Fujii discloses a document requesting system enabling the client to specify documents to be received in advance only with the functions of the client and a method of receiving related documents in advance. The document requesting system for requesting transfer of related documents to be received in advance includes means for extracting from a first document transferred by request an identifier specifying a second document linked to the first document; and means for determining the degree of association between the second document specified by the extracted identifier and a predetermined document as a reference, the second document being determined to be one of the related documents in the case where the degree of association is larger than a specific degree of association (see column 2, lines 1-21). The document requesting system further including a condition judging section which is a program that judges whether or not the document corresponding to the identifier extracted in the document identifier extracting section is a document file to be received in advance, on the basis of the degree of association between the document specified by the identifier and the first requested document.

Mukai discloses a document processor for processing a document in accordance with a detected degree of importance corresponding to a data link within the document. The document processor includes a document gain means which gains documents of texts and link data such

as images and sounds stored in a document storage means connected to the document gain means by a network. The documents and the data such as the images and the sounds which should be gained are designated by a user. A temporary document storage means temporarily stores for display the documents and the data such as the images and the sounds which have been gained by the document gain means. A conditional storage means stores conditions for judging degrees of importance of data associated with each other by link information contained in the documents. The link information is associated with the link data (see column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 27).

The Examiner admits that Fujii fails to disclose “extracting the document updated or collected during a first time period”. However, the Examiner asserts that Mukai discloses the deficiencies of Fujii. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Neither Fujii nor Mukai disclose “extracting the document updated or collected during a first time period; and calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents based on information about relations of said particular one referencing to the other extracted documents and of said particular one referenced by the other extracted documents,” as recited in amended claim 1.

For example, the Examiner asserts that column 8, lines 15-53 of Fujii discloses “calculating the popularity degree for each extracted document”. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Fujii discloses “a judgment made to specify related documents by determining the depth of link between each of the documents specified by URLs and the first requested document thereby making it possible to selectively received only documents with high degree of association in advance”. Fujii does not teach or suggest “calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents” as recited in amended claim 1.

Further the Examiner asserts that column 8, lines 1-39 of Mukai discloses “extracting the document updated or collected during a first time period”. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that column 8, lines 1-39 of Mukai discloses not extracting the document itself, but extracting data within a document, specifically non-text data and a user designates graphics corresponding to an image and if the user has judged that the image corresponding to the graphic is not so important, the user can inform the document processor by selecting a “needless button” as an indication that the non-text data is unimportant. Further, data sizes, dimensions such as width and height of the data in the document display means or kinds of the data may be utilized as the conditions for judging the degrees of importance of the data.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims 10, 22, 26, 31, 32 (from which claims 2-3, 11-17, 19-21 and 25 respectively

depend); and claim 41 over the cited references.

Further neither Fujii nor Mukai, individually or combined, teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 42 and 43. Specifically, neither Fujii nor Mukai teach or suggest “extracting a link relation from a first document, and judging whether a second document linked to by the first document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document, based on the link relation,” as recited in claim 42. The Examiner asserts that Fujii discloses this feature at column 8, lines 15-39 and Mukai at column 4, line 55 – column 5, lines 21. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that although Fujii discloses link information, Mukai does not make up for the deficiencies of Fujii. That is, Mukai discloses patterns of names of the data associated with each other by the link information, based on a user’s empirical comprehension that data having names of specific patterns are mostly unimportant, gain of such data is useless. For example, data having a pattern of a name coincident with “dot.gif” and “dot.bmp” has a degree “1” of importance and data having patterns of names coincident with “Ball.” and “bullet” having the degree of “1” of importance and data having other patterns whose names are unknown have a degree “2” of importance (see column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 21).

In addition, the foregoing references relied upon fail teach or suggest “extracting a tag for designating user input from the document, and judging the type of the service provided by the document, based on the tag designating user input,” as recited in claim 43. The Examiner asserts that Fujii teaches extracting a tag designating user input from the document at column 6, lines 21-37 and Mukai teaches “judging the type of service provided by the document, based on the tag designating user input at column 8, lines 1-33. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that although Fujii refers to tags such as HTMLs, Mukai fails to make up for the deficiencies of Fujii. That is, Mukai instead teaches a user designating a graphic corresponding to a non-text data and determining whether the non-text data is unimportant (see column 8, lines 15-33).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection has been overcome.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 18, 33 AND 35, 36, 37 AND 39 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER FUJII IN VIEW OF MUKAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF PAGE (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,285,999):

Regarding claim 18, the Examiner admits that Fujii and Mukai fail to disclose “not registering the second document in a database as the non-text document related to the contents of the first document, when the first document includes a third document with a file name similar to a file name of the second document and when the file name of the second document is ranked lower than the file name of the third document in a dictionary order”. However, the Examiner asserts that Page discloses these limitations at column 8, lines 21-48. The Applicant

respectfully disagrees.

Instead, Page discloses at column 8, lines 21-48, a search engine used to locate documents that match the specified search criteria, either by searching full text or by searching titles only. The search includes anchor text associated with backlinks to a page. Once a set of documents is identified that match the search terms, the list of documents is then sorted with high ranking documents first and low ranking documents last. The ranking combines objective ranking and textual matching (see column 8, lines 41-48). That is, Page fails to disclose "when the first document includes a third document with a file name similar to a file name of the second document and when the file name of the second document is ranked lower than the file name of the third document in a dictionary order" as recited in claim 18.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above comments directed to amended claim 1, would be helpful in understanding differences of the rejected claims 33, 35, 36, 37 and 39 over the cited references.

Thus, claims 18, 33 and 35, 36, 37 and 39 patentably distinguish over Fujii in view of Mukai and further in view of Page. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept 28, 2004

By: Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501